1. Attendance:
   Aero – Mei Zhuang
   AVN – Not present (Seth Young)
   BME – Mark Ruegsegger (for Rita Alevriadou)
   CHE – Jeff Chalmers
   CEGS – (Civil, Environmental, Geomatics) – Hal Walker
   CSE – Bruce Weide
   ECE – George Valco
   ENG PHY – Harris Kagan
   FAB – Not present (Ann Christy)
   ISE –
      ISE – Clark Mount-Campbell - chair
      WLD – Not present (John Lippold)
   MSE – Kathy Flores
   ME – Marcelo Dapino
   Graduate Student – Bob Lowe, Hamsa Priya Mohana-Sundaram
   Undergraduate Student – Anchie Huang (not present Amritesh Rai)
   Secretary – Ed McCaul
   Guests – Dave Tomasko, Pam Hussen

2. Committee members introduced themselves.

3. The minutes from the 1 June 2009 meeting were approved as corrected.

4. The following subcommittee assignments were announced:
   4.1. Subcommittee A (chair is to be determined)
      4.1.1. Mei Zhuang
      4.1.2. Bruce Weide
      4.1.3. George Valco
      4.1.4. John Lippold
      4.1.5. Amritesh Rai
   4.2. Subcommittee B
      4.2.1. Seth Young
      4.2.2. Ann Christy
      4.2.3. Kathy Flores
      4.2.4. Marcelo Dapino (chair)
      4.2.5. Hamsa Priya Mohana-Sundaram
   4.3. Course Proposal Subcommittee
      4.3.1. Rita Alevriadou
      4.3.2. Jeff Chalmers
      4.3.3. Hal Walker (chair)
      4.3.4. Harris Kagan
      4.3.5. Anchie Huang
4.3.6. Bob Lowe

5. It was decided that the Subcommittee A and B will review both the curriculum and accompanying course proposals when reviewing the quarters to semesters proposals and that the Course Proposal Subcommittee will review some of the quarters to semesters proposals.

6. The committee secretary was asked to send the revised Aero and Mechanical Merger Proposal to Subcommittee A for their review.

7. The Aviation Center Proposal will go to Subcommittee B when the revised proposal has been received. It was noted that the research side of the college needs to define what is needed for a center and develop appropriate guidelines before the Aviation Center Proposal can be approved. The question was asked as to when the revised proposal will be sent to the committee. The response was that while it is being worked on it is not known when the revised proposal will be completed.

8. Dave Tomasko updated the committee on what the Quarters-to-Semesters Task Force has been doing.
   8.1. The task force met a couple of times over the summer. Every degree program has a representative. In addition, students, advisors, and EEIC have representatives.
   8.2. No guidance has been received from the Office of Academic Affairs, OAA, but Dave met with Dave Andereck, Associate Dean in Math and Physical Science, about not getting any guidance from OAA. A number of the associate deans are beginning to put pressure on OAA in the hopes of getting some guidance. The idea is to be proactive.
   8.3. Dave would encourage everyone to think open minded about the possibilities that the change to semesters presents to us for curriculum change.

9. A proposed template that would be used by the various programs to submit their quarters-to-semesters proposals to CCAA was presented to the committee. The draft was created over the summer by Dave Tomasko and Ed McCaul and has been vetted by the Quarters-to-Semesters Task Force. The purpose of the template is to let everyone know what they need to include in their proposal and to keep the proposals as uniform and lean as possible. Not all of the items discussed in the OAA handbook on curriculum changes have been included in the template as many of the items are not relevant to the quarters-to-semesters change. The information required in the syllabus is based on the information required in a new course request and is in the same order as the form. The thought is that if we need to enter the data or complete a new course request form that students at the college could easily enter this information for everyone. Dave Tomasko stated that he plans on being proactive and submitting the template once it has been approved by CCAA to OAA to gain their agreement with our use of the template and perhaps they would like to use it throughout the university. Jeff Chalmers made a motion that the
template be approved by the committee. George Valco seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

9.1. The comment was made that the inclusion of the degree table did not seem necessary and should be made into a separate document. Jeff Chalmers and George Valco accepted this idea as a friendly amendment.

9.2. The question was asked as to whether we need to include syllabi for all of our courses in the proposal especially graduate courses. The response was that at this time it would be best that everyone think about syllabi for all of their courses but that it may be decided later that only courses required by undergraduates will need to be submitted with the proposals. However, we will need to have syllabi ready for all of the courses our undergraduates take when we have our ABET review in the autumn of 2011.

9.3. A motion was made to amend the template to include conditions for acceptance to the major and conditions for graduation should be included in the proposals. It was discussed that if these two items were included it would force everyone to think about admission and enrollment management. The comment was made that admission to the major and enrollment management are two separate issues. The comment was made that these two items could be done later and are not necessary for the creation of a semester curriculum. The comment was made that these two issues are part of every program’s ASAP policy and are best discussed by that committee. A vote was taken on whether to include the conditions for acceptance to the major and conditions for graduation in the template: 0 approved, 12 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

9.4. The comment was made that while the proposed syllabus includes all of the information that course request requires that it would be easier for everyone if we used our normal ABET syllabus format and order and added any other information at the end of the syllabus. Doing this will save everyone time as we will need to have our syllabi in the ABET format when we undergo ABET review. Jeff Chalmers and George Valco accepted this idea as a friendly amendment.

9.5. There being no further discussion a vote was taken on the motion of approving the template with the degree table being separated from the template and the syllabus submission format being changed to reflect our ABET syllabus format with any additional required information following that. The vote was: 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed. (The approved template is attached.)

9.6. Jeff Chalmers made a motion that Clark Mount-Campbell and Dave Tomasko present the template to other colleges to get their buy in and, also, to present it to OAA. There being no discussion a vote was taken on the motion. The vote was: 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

10. The comment was made that getting concurrences on the new semester courses could become a major issue. All too often programs will not respond to requests for concurrences and delay getting a course approved. The committee may need to create a time limit for programs to consider requests for concurrence. The comment was made that the committee may want to consider posting the courses on line and have programs check them there. The comment was made that this may not be
practical due to the large number of courses that everyone would have to review. The comment was made that the change to semesters is an opportunity to review all of the cross listed courses to determine if cross listing is really necessary. It was decided that this would be an issue the committee would need to discuss again.

11. The committee was asked to consider if they would like to establish a deadline for the final submission of courses under the quarter system and to extend the number of times group study courses could be offered.
   11.1. The comment was made that the flow of course requests will probably slow down on its own.
   11.2. The comment was made that it is probably premature to consider such a deadline at this time.
   11.3. The comment was made that it would be a good idea to discourage people from making quarter course submissions and to have everyone start thinking about semesters.
   11.4. It was decided that this issue would be reconsidered at a later date if it becomes a problem.

12. The meeting was adjourned at 9:53.
College of Engineering Quarters to Semesters Proposal Template
Approved by CCAA 1 October 2009

The College of Engineering’s Quarters to Semesters Proposal will consist of the following items along with new course requests and syllabi from all units:

The College’s Executive Summary will cover the following topics:
1. The common core taken by all engineering students (introduction to engineering, math, science, liberal arts)
2. The college’s transition policy philosophy (students, courses)
3. Formation of a college level transition committee
4. A table comparing the number of quarter hours to the number of semester hours in each of the undergraduate, professional, and graduate programs as well as each of the minors.

Each program’s proposal will cover the following topics when appropriate:
1. An executive summary signed by the department chair to include the program’s approach to the change.
2. The results of the faculty vote.
3. Input from the program’s constituency (e.g. students, advisory board)
4. The program’s goals and how the semester curriculum covers them for all degrees.
5. An undergraduate proposal
   a. The program’s educational objectives and how the semester curriculum covers them.
   b. The program’s outcomes
   c. Mapping of the program’s course outcomes to program’s outcomes (and ABET’s A-K as appropriate)
   d. An old and new undergraduate “bingo” sheet
   e. A transition plan to include information on each rank (time to degree) and bridge courses as appropriate
6. A professional proposal
   a. A comparison of the old and new professional curriculum
   b. A transition plan and bridge courses as appropriate
7. A graduate proposal
   a. A comparison of the old and new graduate curriculum
   b. A transition plan for master and doctoral students and bridge courses as appropriate
8. A minor(s) proposal (13-20 semester credit hours)
   a. A comparison of the old and new minor curriculum
   b. A transition plan and bridge courses as appropriate
9. New course requests and syllabi for each course with syllabi being in the attached format.
CCAA Submission Syllabus

There will be two parts to each syllabi. The first part will be in the standard ABET format and only include that information normally required by the college. That part will not be more than two pages in length with a font size of 12-point and one-inch margins all around. The second part will consist of information normally found on a new course request that the registrar’s office needs to properly enter the course. Please note that cross listed courses must have identical syllabi with the only exceptions being the program name and course number.

First Part:
1. Department, Number, and Title of Course
2. Designation as a ‘Required’ or ‘Elective’ course in a particular Engineering degree or minor program
3. Description (25 words for Course Description Bulletin)
4. Level, Credits, Class Time Distribution
5. Prerequisites
6. Semesters Offered, General Information, Exclusions, Cross-Listings, etc.
7. Learning Outcomes
8. Textbooks and Other Materials
9. Topics (including approximate duration, adding up to the course length in classroom hours or weeks)
10. Representative Lab Assignments (if applicable)
11. Grading Plan
12. Relationship to ABET Criterion 3 Outcomes (a-k)
13. Relationship to ABET-Accredited Program Outcomes
14. Preparer Information (including date of preparation)

Second Part:
1. 18 character transcript abbreviation
2. Repeatability
3. Grade option (letter, S/U, progress)
4. Special designation (honors, off-campus, GEC)
5. Subject code, subsidy level (B, D, or P)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit/Program</th>
<th>UG Degree</th>
<th>UG Minor</th>
<th>Professional Degree</th>
<th>Graduate Degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Executive Summary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAB</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geodetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geomatics</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welding</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>